

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,190	07/10/2000	Riaz Yousuf Hussain	AUS000127US1	8782
35525	7590 07/30/2004		EXAMINER CURCIO, JAMES A F	
IBM CORP	(YA)			
	ASSOCIATES PC	•	ADTIBUT	DARED MILLARED
P.O. BOX 802333			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DALLAS, T	X 75380	i da	2122	a
1		7	DATE MAILED: 07/30/200	-1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



			1		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/613,190	HUSSAIN ET AL.	Tr		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	James Curcio	2132			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address	s		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH e, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 10) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this commur DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.		
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 J	uly 2000.				
•	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-49</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-49</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc	cepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached C	Office Action or form PTO-1	52.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Appority documents have been re nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stag	ge		
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Sun Paper No(s)/N 5) Notice of Info	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date rmal Patent Application (PTO-152))		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:				

Art Unit: 2132

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35
 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this
 Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-49 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baldwin, Jr. et al (US005452449A).
- As per claim 1, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses steps for reading trace data for a module (Fig. 1 element 20 and associated text;
 Fig. 2 elements 30, 32, and associated text; Fig. 3 element 31 and associated text; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63),

comparing the trace data with module symbolic data in a merged symbol file (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63), and

verifying that the trace data matches the module symbolic data in the merged symbol file based on one or more predetermined criteria (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63).

4. As per claim 16, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses steps for

Art Unit: 2132

reading module trace data from a trace file (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63),

reading module symbolic data from a symbolic data file (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63),

verifying that the module symbolic data corresponds to the module trace data (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 1:13-17; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63),

correlating the module symbolic data with the module trace data to generate correlated data (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63), and

displaying the correlated data (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63).

5. As per claim 27, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses a trace data storage device, a merged symbol file storage device, and a processor coupled to the trace data storage device and the merged symbolic data storage device . . . (see claim 1 rejection).

- 6. As per claim 41, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses a trace data storage device, a symbolic data storage device, and a processor coupled to the trace data storage device and the symbolic data storage device . . . (see claim 16 rejection).
- 7. As per claim 42, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses first instructions for reading trace data for a module, second instructions for comparing the trace data with module symbolic data in a merged symbol file, and third instructions for verifying that the trace data matches the module symbolic data in the merged symbol file based on one or more predetermined criteria (see claim 1 rejection).
- 8. As per claim 49, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses first instructions for reading module trace data from a trace file, second instructions for reading module symbolic data from a symbolic data file, third instructions for verifying that the module symbolic data corresponds to the module trace data, fourth instructions for correlating the module symbolic data with the module trace data to generate correlated data, and fifth instructions for displaying the correlated data (see claim 1 rejection).
- 9. As per claim 17, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claim 16, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses steps for comparing the trace data with the module symbolic data, and verifying that the trace data matches the module symbolic data based on one or more predetermined criteria (see claim 1 rejection).

- 10. As per claims 2, 18, 28, and 43, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1, 17, 27, and 42, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses one or more predetermined criteria that include one or more of a checksum, a timestamp, a fully qualified path, and a segment size (Fig. 1 element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 elements 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, and associated text; Fig. 3 element 31 and associated text; col. 9:19-23).
- 11. As per claims 3-4, 19-20, 29, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1, 16, and 27, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses that the trace data is read from a trace buffer and/or from a trace file written to a storage device and that the trace data storage device is a trace buffer (Fig. 1 element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 elements 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, and associated text; Fig. 3 element 31 and associated text; col. 1:13-17).
- 12. As per claims 5, 6, 30, and 31, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1 and 27, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses that a processor reads the trace data, compares the trace data with module symbolic data, and verifies that the trace data matches the module symbolic data dynamically as trace data is written to a trace buffer or trace data storage device and/or performed at a remote time from when the trace data is

written to a trace file or trace data storage device (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 1:13-17; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63; col. 9:19-23).

13. As per claims 7, 8, 9, 32, 33, 34, 44, 45, and 46, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1, 27, and 42, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses

a processor and/or second instructions that compare the trace data with module symbolic data in a merged symbol file and further compare a fully a checksum and timestamp in the trace data with checksum and timestamp in the module symbolic data in the merged symbol file (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 - elements 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 1:13-17; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63; col. 9:19-23);

a fully qualified path in the trace data with a fully qualified path in the module symbolic data, if the checksum and timestamp in the trace data does not match the checksum and timestamp in the module symbolic data or the checksum and timestamp in the trace data is not available (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 1:13-17; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63; col. 9:19-23);

and the trace data with module symbolic data in a merged symbol file by further comparing a segment length in the trace data with a segment length in the module symbolic data, if the fully qualified path in the trace data does not match the fully qualified path in the module symbolic data (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 1:13-17; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63; col. 9:19-23).

- 14. As per claims 10, 11, 21, 22, 35, and 36, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1, 17, and 27, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses one or more predetermined criteria—checksum and timestamp, a fully qualified path, and a segment size, wherein they have an associated priorities, the checksum and timestamp having the highest priority and the segment size having the lowest priority (Fig. 1 element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 elements 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, and associated text; Fig. 3 element 31 and associated text; col. 1:13-17; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63; col. 9:19-23).
- 15. As per claims 12, 13, 23, 24, 37, 38, 47, and 48, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1, 16, 27, and 42, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses

a merged symbol file that includes a plurality of module entries (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44,

Art Unit: 2132

46, 48, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 1:13-17; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63; col. 9:19-23),

second instructions for comparing the trace data with module symbolic data in a merged symbol file that include instructions for identifying a module entry that is a best match with the trace data (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 1:13-17; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63; col. 9:19-23),

wherein these instructions include further instructions for comparing the trace data to each of the plurality of module entries and identifying one of the plurality of module entries as a best match based on which of the one or more criteria is used to verify the module entry (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 1:13-17; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63; col. 9:19-23).

16. As per claims 14, 15, 25, 26, 39, and 40, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1, 16, and 27, Baldwin, Jr. et al discloses trace data that includes redundant information identifying a module for each segment of the module, redundant information that includes at least one of module checksum, module timestamp, and module fully qualified path (Fig. 1 – element 20 and associated text; Fig. 2 – elements 30, 32,

Art Unit: 2132

34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, and associated text; Fig. 3 – element 31 and associated text; col. 1:13-17; col. 4:30 to col. 5:63; col. 9:19-23).

Double Patenting

17. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

18. Claims 1-49 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-26 of U. S. Patent No. US006658416B1 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter.

19. As per the instant application's claim 1, US006658416B1's claims include steps for reading trace data for a module, comparing the trace data with module

symbolic data in a merged symbol file, and verifying that the trace data matches the module symbolic data in the merged symbol file based on one or more predetermined criteria (US006658416B1 - claims 5 and 7).

- 20. As per the instant application's claim 16, US006658416B1's claims include steps for reading module trace data from a trace file, reading module symbolic data from a symbolic data file, verifying that the module symbolic data corresponds to the module trace data, correlating the module symbolic data with the module trace data to generate correlated data, and displaying the correlated data (US006658416B1 claims 2 and 5).
- 21. As per the instant application's claim 27, US006658416B1's claims include a trace data storage device, a merged symbol file storage device, and a processor coupled to the trace data storage device and the merged symbolic data storage device . . . (US006658416B1 claims 14 and 16).
- 22. As per the instant application's claim 41, US006658416B1's claims include a trace data storage device, a symbolic data storage device, and a processor coupled to the trace data storage device and the symbolic data storage device . . . (US006658416B1 claim 10).
- 23. As per the instant application's claim 42, US006658416B1's claims include first instructions for reading trace data for a module, second instructions

for comparing the trace data with module symbolic data in a merged symbol file, and third instructions for verifying that the trace data matches the module symbolic data in the merged symbol file based on one or more predetermined criteria (US006658416B1 - claims 23 and 25).

- 24. As per the instant application's claim 49, US006658416B1's claims include first instructions for reading module trace data from a trace file, second instructions for reading module symbolic data from a symbolic data file, third instructions for verifying that the module symbolic data corresponds to the module trace data, fourth instructions for correlating the module symbolic data with the module trace data to generate correlated data, and fifth instructions for displaying the correlated data (US006658416B1 claims 20 and 23).
- 25. As per claim 17, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claim 16, US006658416B1's claims include steps for comparing the trace data with the module symbolic data, and verifying that the trace data matches the module symbolic data based on one or more predetermined criteria (US006658416B1 claims 5 and 7).
- 26. As per claims 2, 18, 28, and 43, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1, 17, 27, and 42, US006658416B1's claims include one or more predetermined criteria that include

one or more of a checksum, a timestamp, a fully qualified path, and a segment size (US006658416B1 - claims 8, 17, and 26).

- 27. As per claims 3-4, 19-20, 29, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1, 16, and 27, US006658416B1's claims include that the trace data is read from a trace buffer and/or from a trace file written to a storage device and that the trace data storage device is a trace buffer (US006658416B1 claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 20, and 21).
- 28. As per claims 5, 6, 30, and 31, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1 and 27, US006658416B1's claims include that a processor reads the trace data, compares the trace data with module symbolic data, and verifies that the trace data matches the module symbolic data dynamically as trace data is written to a trace buffer or trace data storage device and/or performed at a remote time from when the trace data is written to a trace file or trace data storage device (US006658416B1 claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16).
- 29. As per claims 7, 8, 9, 32, 33, 34, 44, 45, and 46, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1, 27, and 42, US006658416B1's claims include a processor and/or second instructions that compare the trace data with module symbolic data in a merged symbol file and further compare a fully a checksum and timestamp in the trace data with

Art Unit: 2132

checksum and timestamp in the module symbolic data in the merged symbol file; a fully qualified path in the trace data with a fully qualified path in the module symbolic data, if the checksum and timestamp in the trace data does not match the checksum and timestamp in the module symbolic data or the checksum and timestamp in the trace data is not available; and the trace data with module symbolic data in a merged symbol file by further comparing a segment length in the trace data with a segment length in the module symbolic data, if the fully qualified path in the trace data does not match the fully qualified path in the module symbolic data (US006658416B1 - claims 8, 17, 26).

- 30. As per claims 10, 11, 21, 22, 35, and 36, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1, 17, and 27, US006658416B1's claims include one or more predetermined criteria—checksum and timestamp, a fully qualified path, and a segment size, wherein they have an associated priorities, the checksum and timestamp having the highest priority and the segment size having the lowest priority (US006658416B1 claims 8, 17, 26).
- 31. As per claims 12, 13, 23, 24, 37, 38, 47, and 48, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1, 16, 27, and 42, US006658416B1's claims include a merged symbol file that includes a plurality of module entries, second instructions for comparing the trace data with module symbolic data in a merged symbol file that include instructions for identifying a

module entry that is a best match with the trace data, wherein these instructions include further instructions for comparing the trace data to each of the plurality of module entries and identifying one of the plurality of module entries as a best match based on which of the one or more criteria is used to verify the module entry (US006658416B1 - claims 5, 7, 14, 16, 23, and 25).

32. As per claims 14, 15, 25, 26, 39, and 40, in addition to the claimed common subject matter applied above in the rejection of claims 1, 16, and 27, US006658416B1's claims include trace data that includes redundant information identifying a module for each segment of the module, redundant information that includes at least one of module checksum, module timestamp, and module fully qualified path (US006658416B1 - claims 8, 17, 26).

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application, which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Conclusion

- 33. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 34. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Curcio whose telephone number is

703-305-8887. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 7 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam, can be reached on Tuesday to Friday from 7:30 am to 4:30 pm. The examiner's supervisor can also be reached on alternate Mondays. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free).

TUAN DAM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

July 22, 2004

JC

AU 2122